REMARKS

This reply is in response to the Office Action mailed on July 13, 2005 in which Claims 26-29 were withdrawn; in which Claims 16-23 were allowed; in which Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 9-14 were objected to and in which Claims 1-2, 5, 8, 10-13, 15 and 24-25 were rejected. With this response, Claims 8, 15, 24 and 25 are amended and Claims 27-29 are cancelled. Claims 1-25, as amended, are presented for reconsideration and allowance.

I. Examiner Interview Summary

On October 11 and October 12, 2005, telephonic interviews were held between Examiner Morrison and Applicants' attorney, Todd A. Rathe. The non-statutory double patenting rejection of the claims was discussed. In addition, the rejection of Claims 8, 15, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, was discussed. Lastly, the rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and as being anticipated by Nose, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,168,147, was discussed. It was agreed upon that Claim 25, as amended above, overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph and overcomes the rejection based upon Nose, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,168,147. It was agreed upon that Claims 8, 15, 24 and 25, as amended, overcome the rejection under 37 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Lastly, it was agreed upon that the non-statutory double patenting rejection would be withdrawn in light of the substantial differences between the claims of the present application and the claims of the cited patent applications.

Applicants wish to thank Examiner Morrison for the opportunity to discuss the rejections and for Examiner Morrison's suggestions for amending the claims to overcome the rejections.

II. Rejection of Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

Paragraph 2 of the Office Action rejected Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with enablement requirements. As noted above, it was agreed upon during the examiner interview that Claim 25, as now amended,

overcomes the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. In particular, it was agreed upon that the specification provides enabling support for a drive gear operably coupled to the first roller and means for cessating transmission of power to the drive gear after the first roller and second roller have initially and simultaneously engaged a media sheet.

III. Rejection of Claims 8, 15, 24 and 25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph.

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action rejected Claims 8, 15, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In response, Claims 15 and 24 are amended to replace the "second gear" with -- third gear -- as suggested in the Office Action.

Claim 8 is amended to clarify that the first dwell mechanism surface and the third dwell mechanism surface are disengaged in response to the first dwell mechanism surface being rotatably driven at a first rate and the third dwell mechanism surface being rotatably driven at a second slower rate.

Claim 25 is amended to recite a drive gear operably coupled to the first roller a means for cessating transmission of power to the drive gear. It was agreed upon during the examiner interview held on October 11 and October 12, 2005 that Claims 8 and 24, as amended, overcome the rejection under U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

IV. Rejection of Claim 25 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Based upon Nose.

Paragraph 4 of the Office Action rejected Claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Nose, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,168,147. As agreed upon during the examiner interview held on October 11 and October 12, Claim 25, as amended, overcomes the rejection based upon Nose. In particular, it was agreed upon that Nose, et al. fails to disclose a drive gear operably coupled to a roller and

means for cessating transmission of power to the drive gear after the first roller and the second roller have initially and simultaneously engaged a media sheet.

V. Double Patenting Rejection.

Paragraphs 4 through 12 rejected claims of the present application under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over cited claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,666,446, U.S. Patent No. 6,581,924; U.S. Patent No. 6,874,776 and co-pending Application No. 10/633,126. As agreed upon during the examiner interview held on October 11 and October 12, 2005, substantial differences exist between the claims of the present application and the cited claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,666,446; U.S. Patent No. 6,581,924; U.S. Patent No. 6,874,776 and co-pending Application No. 10/633,126. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the double patenting rejection be withdrawn.

VI. Conclusion

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date Oct. 13, 2005 By Todd A. Rathe

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22879
Telephone: (414) 297-5710
Facsimile: (414) 297-4900

Todd A. Rathe
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 38,276